

University of Michigan Law School  
**University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository**

---

Res Gestae

Law School History and Publications

---

1972

January 28, 1972

University of Michigan Law School

Follow this and additional works at: [http://repository.law.umich.edu/res\\_gestae](http://repository.law.umich.edu/res_gestae)



Part of the [Legal Education Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

University of Michigan Law School, "January 28, 1972" (1972). *Res Gestae*. Paper 728.  
[http://repository.law.umich.edu/res\\_gestae/728](http://repository.law.umich.edu/res_gestae/728)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Law School History and Publications at University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Res Gestae by an authorized administrator of University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact [mlaw.repository@umich.edu](mailto:mlaw.repository@umich.edu).

MC  
883  
R4



# RES GESTAE

the law school weekly

a large metropolitan daily fantasy

LAW LIBRARY

Ann Arbor, Michigan

"Yours for the asking"

January 28, 1972

JAN 28 1972

## UNIV. OF MICH. GRADING CODE CRACKED

An unusual series of events in the past week has brought shocking information to light concerning the grading policies of the Law School. Mike Goldband, a first year law student and former Ypsilanti locksmith, revealed that the faculty, in despair of ever finding enough time at termsend to grade all exam papers, had elected to undertake -- secretly -- a truly "fair" grading system.

When the Law School Administration realized that, through Goldband,

Res Gestae intended to print the full story, it undertook an ingenious counter-strategy. An allegedly authentic Grading Policy memo was officially "leaked" to R.G. when a faded, dog-eared xerox of it appeared mysteriously in our mailbox. This patently transparent manouever to throw R.G. staffers off the trail of the real story didnot succeed. Our own Mike Slaughter got the real scoop which follows. We've printed the "official" version after that as yet another example of the Law School's duplicity.

-- The Editors

Puzzled by the grading system? Ever wondered why you were supposed to put only your social security number on the front of your exam book, and why there were never any marks inside? Well, the key to these questions and more has been passed to the RG by one Michael Goldband, who secreted a folder of top secret grading policy memoranda from the special Law School files located on the first floor of Hutchins Hall in a room innocently marked "MEN" (now we also know why that door's always locked).

You probably thought (1) that the numbers were used to obtain objective evaluation, and (2) that there just wasn't time to write comments inside of bluebooks. But according to the Goldband Papers, it turns out what you write on your exams has nothing to do with your grade -- instructors

don't even look at that stuff. Grades actually are based entirely on a computer analysis of that social security number you put on the outside of your booklet.

Yes, at the end of each semester the Law School simply runs all the exam covers through a new computer program which distributes grades on the basis of mathematical manipulations of your number. First, there's the Jackpot test, that gives an A+ to any number that follows the sequence of musical intervals in a certain chant by an obscure Medieval composer named Josquin des Donahue. If no gongs ring after this one, A's are awarded to numbers consisting completely of primes (naturally). Next, the Stoned Cold test prints out a B+ for any number the sum of whose digits is a factor of

cont. p. 3

# TAN CITY

## SUMMERING IN DENVER

Last year the University of Denver initiated its first Summer Institute in Clinical Legal Education offering its program to out-of-state students. This summer the law school will again be opening its doors to students from across the country. The Institute will be an intensive ten-week course, involving students in two chosen internships supervised by the College of Law's regular and clinical faculty. Nine specialized internships will be offered in such areas as criminal law, juvenile and family law, urban studies, consumer law, prisoner assistance and environmental law. Students may receive five quarter hours of credit for successful participation. [consult Kuklin, Betts & Co. on this --Ed.]

Internships involved in criminal, juvenile and family law are specifically oriented to trial experience. The student handles his own cases, as counsel of record, from the interviewing stage through trial. The University of Denver College of Law operates its own Defender Program Office where indigent persons charged with criminal misdemeanors may seek student counsel. In civil cases, the students work under the auspices of the Legal Aid Society and the Family and Juvenile Law Center. Other internships are directed toward involving students in specific areas of public interest law. They serve as an excellent vehicle to gain expertise in specialized fields. Classroom discussion and analysis are considered an integral part of the internship program and a variety of seminars will be offered through the course of the summer.

In conjunction with the ten-week Institute, a two-day Workshop in Clinical Legal Education will be conducted. The objective of the Workshop is to provide assistance to students and clinical directors in expanding existing programs and establishing

## HATE MAIL

[The following letter was received at the beginning of the term. -- Ed.]

To the Editors:

Back to battle the 9 - 5 opposition and welcome back to that cesspool of human self-alienation known to friend and foe alike as Michigan Law School.

How intolerable is even a temporary deference of pleasure, but now that finals are over we can "party" until -- the next set of exams -- the bar exam -- the next work assignment they give to the corporate flunkies (or as a friend calls them "tools") -- but we are corporate flunkies unless we choose not to be -- choice being the essence of freedom -- freedom being a functional illusion (gotta make this letter palatable to my dear friends the nihilists).

When They've Tortured And Scared  
You For  
20 Odd Years  
Then They Expect You To Pick A  
Career...  
There's Room At The Top They Are  
Telling You Still  
But First You Learn How To Smile  
As You Kill

Kill -- Metaphorically speaking, John, kill your "spiritual essence" -- wow heavy -- or as another friend -- once said What is a spiritual being like me doing in a place like this? And really please do tell me how the first year mavericks are different from the third year corporates -- same old puritan ethics permeates the psyches of both -- work hard to make Michigan Law a good place to study and learn infantile notions of success -- dear first year rebels -- the only way to beat the system at their game is to play the game and what inexorably follows from that -- is that those who play the game become less than human -- not more human as social conscience proselytizers would have you believe -- Peace, Love, p<sup>a</sup>ttitudes and banalities for those that still need them.

cont'd p.10

page two

/s/ Marc Resnick

cont.(incredibly

# CRACKED CODE

cont. from p. 1

the total count of gargoyles in the Quad. C's are granted to numbers with a 0 in them somewhere (naturally again). All other grades are assigned randomly to any numbers that fail the previous tests.

The designers of this system, however, were shrewd enough to provide for exactly the contingency that prompted this expose. Phase II of the classified grading policy called for a special fund to be created in the event of a leak. It would pay the law students who got the best grades out of the

present system to go through all the exam books and write completely illegible comments and sundry check marks, underlings and slashes any place beside the answers. That was to produce evidence to impugn the credibility of any truly courageous investigative reporting on what are now the Goldband Papers. But everybody can profit in the exam book write-up if you just say to the secretary upstairs handling the project, the secret password -- "I've gotten a gold mine, but I don't want the shaft."

And now friends, for the "official" version of the Law School grading policy, printed straight off the xeroxed memo "leaked" into our mailbox:

## GRADING POLICY

Approved by the Faculty: November 5, 1968

On November 5, 1968, the faculty adopted the revised table of "grading guidelines" set forth below. It also approved the proposition that these guidelines should be viewed as representing the accumulated experience of the faculty concerning the approximate percentages of our student body who fall into the qualitative categories represented in our grading system. Especially at the extremes a faculty member should feel free to apply his own judgment of student performance that is outstanding (A+) or largely or totally deficient (D and E). The latter categories (D and E) should be viewed by the teacher as representing a judgment that if the student's work in one other course (in the case of an E) or in several other courses (in the case of a D) is evaluated the same way by other teachers the student should be excluded from school because of failure to meet the minimum academic standards associated with law study at Michigan and the grant of a Michigan degree. No teacher should view these extreme categories as an affirmative expectation. At these levels the guidelines are suggested maximums rather than suggested minimums. This interpretation is epitomized in the tables by stating these categories in terms of a range between 0 and the suggested maximum.

cont'd "BOGUS" p. 5

# Pedagog Pix

ON VINCE BLASI

--by Robert Lloyd Rubinstein

I have decided to interrupt my career of eating pizza and buying Gilbert cans to write a few articles on our law school and those who people it. As my article last semester was lovingly embraced by all of those it was meant to condemn, I approach this semester's series of \* with the confidence and sense of purpose that only the knowledge of one's impotence can give. This piece, as well as some that will follow it, centers on a single law professor.

The decision to write about law professors was made not so much because they are such an interesting group but, rather, because, like \* and panhandlers, they are always around. These articles will, of necessity, be very impressionistic and subjective because (1) my class attendance in law school has always been something less than exemplary, and (2) it is difficult to evaluate a guy who is trying to explain the importance of laches in the twentieth century. Before zeroing in on this weeks victim I want to say that each and every law professor I have come in contact with has treated me in a very gentlemanly and helpful way. They are an admirable group in many ways, as we are all made to realize, but they are not above criticism.

As a starting point I have decided to light on Vince Blasi. To me, Vince Blasi's most outstanding characteristic is that he appears to be human. In a faculty populated by air "electricity" Browder, Joe "I-got-into-a-good-thing-early" Sax and the late George Palmer even the appurtenances of being a living, breathing organism is note-worthy. To prove my point, can any reader of this piece (if there are any who fall into this select group) picture Conard,

EDITORS' NOTE; This is the beginning of what promises to be a series of affectionate insights into the Law School's august faculty. The asterisks represent our inability to crack the author's code in certain instances. Answers next week.

Hawkins, Siegal, etc. having sex or belching after a good meal? I have often felt that if I were to go up to a law professor and tell him to get fucked he would summarily curl his brow and accuse me of being very contentious. At least Blasi would, (I think), tell me to go to hell or give some evidence that their lies in his \* something other than 13 F. Supp. 442.

A Vince Blasi class is alive, if nothing else. Although it is sometimes disconcerting to not have the answers given to you it is, nevertheless, a good feeling to come up with your own answer or, better yet, come to the realization that there is no "correct" answer and more thought is necessary. Blasi dresses in a casual fashion and that informality is reflected in class discussion. (Although I must admit that his barbaric habit of wearing boots outside his pants has more than once inspired me to acute nausea.) Speaking in his class is not a source of fear nor is keeping quiet. Blasi's mind moves so quickly that it works a hardship on his speech which bursts out in an almost spasmodic frenzy. Note-taking is further complicated because it takes an Act of God to keep him on one topic. Learning from Blasi might not be as neat and easy as studying under other professors but at least two weeks after exams you still remember something about the course besides your grade.

This idea of humanity is important (or "not unimportant" for all you Felix Frankfurter Fans) in a law school such as ours. The law easily lends itself to a neutral impersonal uniformity that can be a weakness as well as a strength. The students of this law school will matriculate as important figures in their chosen communities and, as such, we all have a stake in



## BOGUS MEMO cont.

from p. 3

1964  
1968  
1972

In the lower ranges (D+, D and E) the new norms represent a reduction from the old norms to a total of 5% in the first year compared with the former 9%, and to a total of 4% in the 2d and 3d years compared to the former 7%. It is pertinent to note that the old norms were adopted in 1965 for the purpose of adjusting grading practices to the upward trend in the qualifications of entering students. That upward trend has continued. The first year class in 1964-65 had a median LSAT of 601, and a median adjusted college GPA of 2.39. The 1968 entering class had a median LSAT of 630, and a median adjusted GPA of 2.70. More pertinent to the evaluation of performance at lower levels is the fact that in the 1964 entering class 11% of the students fall below 525 on the LSAT, as against slightly less than 3% (13 students) in the 1968 entering class.

### Grading Guidelines

| First Year: |            | Second and Third Year: |          |
|-------------|------------|------------------------|----------|
| A+          | 0% to 3%   | A+                     | 0% to 3% |
| A           | 12%        | A                      | 15%      |
| B+          | 15%        | B+                     | 17%      |
| B           | 20%        | B                      | 24%      |
| C+          | 28%        | C+                     | 22%      |
| C           | 17%        | C                      | 15%      |
| D+          | 0% to 3%   | D+                     | 0% to 3% |
| D           | 0% to 1.5% | D                      | 0% to 1% |
| E           | 0% to 0.5% | E                      | --       |

92%  
47  
45  
92

93%

## SACCO cont.

from p. 12

It is sometimes overdrawn. The judge, D.A., and Governor often make George Wallace seem likable. The beautiful wife and children cry and faint on cue. An aryan Boston attorney becomes radicalized. "Hard hats" continually throw eggs and spit on the good guys.

The most underplayed aspect of the film is the attitudes of the "stars." Sacco seems to want to live, whereas Vanzetti has more than his touch of martyrdom. The plot over-emphasizes the trial and events while treating too superficially the human beings involved. Enough pseudo-serious corn -- Sacco and Vanzetti is a fast-moving, heavy, contemporary film, and like they say, it sure beats studying.

Not so for the sneak preview. It was really shitty. Pardon the scatological allusion, but, no kidding, if the movie Deep End ever shows at your local theater, go read Moynihan on Real Property -- it's much more interesting. This is an English film about, I suppose, the would-be sexual awakening of a 15 year old guy. Don't get excited, there's not even any good flesh shots (of either sex, libbers). Even you resident sado-masochists can't groove, despite the final scene when in a blood-filled swimming pool (in the deep end--get it) our awakened and horny young lad cavorts in his ultimate wet dream with his dead "lover." Oedipus should turn over in his grave.

# ROCKIN' ROBBEN II

The second part of RG's interview with President Robben Fleming follows:

## University Autonomy Suit

RG: Do you think the language of the decision on university autonomy will let you do more things that you want to do, or will it just give you peace of mind for what you already have been doing?

Fleming: Well, some of both. We have always felt confident that we would win that case in the legal sense, because those lawsuits have recurred at periods of every few years ever since the university began. And we've won the law suits... Now, there is in another sense, no such thing as winning that kind of a law suit, because everybody concedes in the last analysis that the legislature must appropriate the money... From our standpoint, what those lawsuits do is recurrently remind us both of what our proper spheres of influence are.... Therefore, we have continued to govern the University in a way we historically have, and by in large in many of these [the appropriation bill restrictions] they didn't build teeth into them.

## Sex Discrimination

RG: As a sort of transition question regarding the general University, why do you think there are so few women college administrators, and that there's such an uneven distribution of women faculty across all departments? Are they unsuited for the positions or what?

Fleming: No, I don't think they're unsuited or unqualified. Women applicants [to college] are very able, and all their test scores, their grades and so forth show this. When they go into graduate work and get degrees there is no question that they have not been considered historically on the same bases as the men. Now, you

can call that discrimination, or you can say that was the way our total society looked at the problem.

RG: How are the two things different?

Fleming: Because something isn't necessarily discrimination if the society accepts those rules. If that's the way you believe about it, why, it seems to me it is not necessarily discriminatory. Discrimination is in the eye of the observer; if you think that something is discriminatory, it is, but if two people are not competing for something then you may think it's wrong but it's not necessarily discriminatory. In the last few years we have begun as a society to re-think that question of whether the historic roles of men and women in the society as we've envisioned them are necessarily either correct or acceptable or right, any way you want to put it. And we are now much more saying that's not right or that's not acceptable. Women ought to be considered in the same way as men in respect to the professional life. I think that will come about. That answers the previous question, why doesn't one find women in administrative ranks. Well, you don't find them by in large because if you look at the way male administrators come up the chain, you'll see that they tend to be department chairmen, deans, vice-presidents and that sort of thing. Now because women have not been in the chain at lower levels, they haven't had the same exposure as men. Now I'm not arguing whether that's right or wrong, I'm just saying --

RG: Do you think that's right or wrong?

Fleming: Let's leave aside that question for the minute. They have not had that same experience. Therefore when you go to choose a person at a higher administrative level you won't find many that have had that kind of experience because they have not had an opportunity to be in the market. Now we've concluded that's wrong, and part of the painful transition is going to be the usual problem, when you make a significant social change, of how do you get an instant cure....

# PIRGIM

## PIRGIM PETITION DRIVE TO START IN LAW SCHOOL

A petition drive will begin in the Law School next week proposing the formation of a Public Interest Research Group in Michigan (PIRGIM). PIRGIM is modeled after several other student groups already in operation in Minnesota, Oregon, and Vermont and which were first conceived of by Ralph Nader.

PIRGIM is proposed to be a student-run organization utilizing its resources to research thoroughly issues concerning consumerism, race and sex discrimination, housing and the environment and to present its findings to the general public, to administrative agencies, and the legislature in an attempt to effect change. Petition through the courts will remain an open alternative if corrective legislation does not prove effective or practical.

PIRGIM's organizational plans call for a state-wide board composed of annually elected student representatives from the participating schools in Michigan which presently include the University of Michigan, Michigan State, Wayne State, Michigan Tech., the University of Detroit, and Oakland University. Proportional representation with one representative per 5,000 students is planned.

The state-wide board will act as a policy-setting unit, identifying issues for consideration by a professional staff composed of lawyers, engineers, social and technical scientists, administrators, and student volunteers. The professional staff will correlate the activities of the organization. The staff will bring together expert skill and student participation in an integrated program of research and advocacy. It is anticipated that students will be able to receive academic credit in conjunction with their work with PIRGIM.



PIRGIM would be funded by a student contribution of \$1.50 per semester to be assessed with tuition and other fees. This fee will be refunded at the beginning of the semester to any student who does not wish to participate in the program. It is projected that this method of fee collecting will yield close to \$1 million per year with which PIRGIM may carry out its function.

A petition drive is aimed at registering student support for the funding proposal. A goal of 20,000 signatures for the U of Michigan is set for the drive and hopefully 1000 of these will come from the Law School. The proposal will be presented to the Board of Regents in late February for approval.

For further information stop by at the PIRGIM office in the law library basement. The petition desk will be found outside room 100.

-- Mike Whitsitt &  
Larry Gain  
for PIRGIM

## *RG Inmates*

M. Hall, J. Serritella  
H. Forsyth, J. Scott  
J. Newman, M. Slaughter  
B. Hays, Marginal Argie



### A.C.E. Appointment

RG: Since you were appointed to the AEC committee to advise HEW, what kind of things do you expect to do on that committee?

Fleming: I want to make one thing clear in the first place, there's been a very wide misunderstanding, particularly on the part of the women, that it is a committee to advise Secretary Richardson in the sense he asked for any such committee. It is a committee of the American Council on Education, which is the umbrella educational organization, to bring to Sec. Richardson, assuming he's willing to listen, some of the administrative problems that colleges and universities have in trying to cope with HEW's programs....

RG: Then would you compare ACE to a lobby among various other lobbies?

Fleming: The national academic organizations are groups, whether you want to call them lobbies or simply groups that press to represent the interests of academic institutions.

RG: There's probably no difference except in the mode or quality of lobby. A lobby represents interests.

Fleming: In a sense, the only difference is that they may have a different point of view. The concern of the ACE people is going to be largely in how does HEW administer these programs.... It is quite apparent to those of us in the university world in administrative positions that HEW does not have a well coordinated program around the country. We find regional directors from various regions of the country asking us to do quite different things. Often holding inconsistent things as a matter of fact....The first question that usually arises is that they come to your campus and say they want to see all your files....We don't just let people see our files. Here's a very curious thing and it's one of the great inconsistencies of the academic world that's kind of fun

to watch. If the House Un-American Activities Committee came to our campus and said we want to see your files we'd have a tremendous uproar around here....HEW walks in and says we want to see your files and our women, particularly, say naturally, well of course they should see your files. How else are they going to tell whether you're discriminating. And we said how else is HUAC going to tell whether we have subversives if they can't look at our files. Well, that's different, [they say].

Anyway HEW comes in....They say you've got to show us your files because we've got contracts with you. We finally made some compromises with them: we say, OK, we understand that if you want to tell whether we're discriminating in our salaries, you've got to know what our salaries are. So we'll show you that; we'll show you hiring dates; we'll show salaries -- without names -- we'll tell you who's a woman and who's a man....But we're not going to show you, for instance when a typical academic appointment is made we write around for a half a dozen references and say, on a confidential basis, will you give us your analysis of X. Now those are all in the file; we have assured the people who wrote to us that those are confidential, we won't show them....It's not that we want to make their program ineffective, it is that...we say you ought to have some policy in this respect [or that respect, with regard to a wide variety of problems]. Don't come tell us in California one thing, and in Atlanta another thing, and in Detroit another. You're working under the same basic law and you ought to have a policy. We're entitled to know what it is.

### Women's Commission and Probe

RG: How have your closed sessions with the Committee on Women gone? Have you been satisfied with them?

Fleming: Well, there really haven't been any. I was quite amused at the last one. They asked me whether it should be public or private and I

# BLASI

cont. from p. 4

trying to develop sensitivity to human problems and values in each and every one of them. Our legal models should be alive to the world of today so that we do not enter it as a group of well educated ethical corpses ala John Mitchell. Certainly style should not be put above content but the hypothesis has taught us that style is a great influence on substance. Striking a "professional" visage is not enough in a world that is screaming out for the touch of humanity in its courts.

Law school involves great expenditures of time and money. In picking a course each law student should realize these costs. A Vince Blasi course spends these limited resources wisely, with his Free Speech Seminar an especially good buy.

## RUBE'S ARBITRARY RATING

On a 10 point scale

1. Course Structure -- 3. Good on paper, anarchic in execution.
2. Humanity -- 10. One of the few professors that you can have a beer with and not discuss law shit.
3. Teaching Ability -- 8. Might be less however for those who demand straight lectures on a single topic.
4. Knowledge of Course Materials -- I do not know enough about the law to rate any professor as to his knowledge. Suffice it to say that while the jury is still out on his mastering of Unfair Trade Practices materials his knowledge of the First Amendment seems extensive and is surely growing. He approaches his classes and his materials with a high degree of seriousness and purpose.

Conclusions -- I like the beat. Give him an 85.

## ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

### 1972 SUMMER LAW CLERK PROGRAM

The Administrative Conference of the United States -- a new permanent, independent Federal agency -- is offering a special opportunity for a second-year law student to broaden his legal experience while participating in constructive social change. Five law students from leading law schools will be offered the opportunity to work in Washington this summer.

The Conference, composed of a full-time Chairman, a 10-man Council appointed by the President, representatives from 35 Government agencies, and 34 prominent private citizens, was established in 1968 to handle complaints that the administrative process had become too slow, too expensive, and too unresponsive to the public interest. The Conference has the responsibility to recommend changes and improvements in the procedures through which agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government serve the public.

Areas of current activity by the Conference range from formal licensing and rulemaking to the most informal procedures of the Federal Government. A major concern of the next few years will be the informal administrative process and questions of public participation in agency proceedings. The full-time professional staff is small, but is supplemented by a substantial number of able academic consultants.

Under the summer law student program, the students will work either with university professors who are consultants to the Conference on specific research projects or directly in the Chairman's office under his supervision.

Those interested in further details should contact the person indicated below as soon as possible:

Professors Burt, Carrington, and Vining

cont. from p. 8

said I really don't care....So it ended up with a private session, then just as soon as the private session was over they held a press conference and related everything that had been said....

RG: Why do you think PROBE and some Women's Commission members so disagree with your policies; are they out to discredit you or are they sincere or what?

Fleming: You have to make your own assessment of that. They are highly activist women who believe vigorously that all women have been discriminated against and that no serious effort has been made to do anything about it. I don't agree with them that all women have been discriminated against if you want to make that as a blanket statement. I think it can be demonstrated that that is not so, but they have a point of view.

#### Talking About Women

RG: Last question. How important is it for high office-holders to speak, for instance, using neuter terms like "businessperson," or use "he and she" in place of the generic "he?"

Fleming: I've wondered about that problem, too. Maybe as some people have suggested, we've got to invent a new word that covers it all. We're in a period of particular sensitivity about that.

RG: Do you think that's worthwhile, I mean, the essence of the question is if high office-holders show a sensitivity, does that help ameliorate the problem or is that really irrelevant?

Fleming: Oh, I suppose. I think it may be relevant. I think there's undue sensitivity on that question at this point. But I think it's understandable sensitivity....

RG: Do you think that that should be changed? Doesn't it really make a difference to talk about women....

Fleming: I think you're talking about the difference between substance and symbolism. Does it substantively make a difference or does it symbolically make a difference. Now, substantively I doubt if it makes very much difference. For instance in the law, once one has protected women's rights properly, then to use the word "he" in a generic sense, if it's understood that it encompasses women, seems to me substantively not very significant. Symbolically is another question; if women feel strongly that the use of the generic "he" is demeaning to women, then it's important to try and solve that symbolic problem.

RG: Would you feel that you should follow this practice, and would you advise your administrators to follow the practice [of using neuter terms and avoiding the generic "he"]?

Fleming: We try. I think that it's evident in most public documents that any of us have issued in the last year that we've tried to be conscious of that problem....

RG: Would you put this advice to administrators in a formal instrument... as a symbol like an executive order or its equivalent...would you be favorable to that?

Fleming: ...Well, we've certainly said to our people that they should be conscious of this....I'd have no objection to that if anybody thought that served a useful purpose.

--M.G.S.

cont. from p. 2

**TAN**

further expertise in this developing area of legal education. Agenda for the Workshop will include administration of student internship programs, establishing new programs and other related problems.

If you are interested contact:  
The University of Denver College of Law, Student Internship Program,  
200 West 14th Avenue, Denver, Colorado

P.S. I finally figured out why Law Students dig pro football players so much -- they're both well trained animals.

## L S Reforms Put

Law schools should re-evaluate their curricula and consider reducing the time requirement for a professional law degree from three years to two, a report by a group of legal educators suggests.

They also suggest changes that would break down traditional "authoritarian" roles of law professors and enhance student creativity and initiative.

The 250 page report, financed through a grant from the Ford Foundation, was compiled by the Curriculum Study Project Committee of the Association of American Law Schools (AALS). The report was to the AALS at its annual meeting Dec. 27-30 in Chicago.

Professor Paul D. Carrington, who headed the study, observes that many of the committee's suggestions will be viewed as "radical," indicating the proposed curriculum changes are not likely to come about quickly or painlessly.

"The shrill responses to earlier drafts indicate that the report will be painful to some readers," Carrington writes in an introductory editor's note. "One can only hope that the pains are pains of growth."

A major feature of the report is a recommendation that law schools "should free themselves of received dogmas, such as the conception that all graduates must be trained for omnipotence, or that the first degree in law can be awarded only after three years of law study..."

"Law school programs should reflect functional needs and break free of offerings and approaches that have nothing but longevity to commend them."

Specifically, the report suggests:

--That law schools offer a "standard curriculum" under which students would be admitted after three years of undergraduate training and could qualify for a professional law degree after two years of study. Currently, law schools require four years of undergraduate work and three years at law school for a professional law degree. The new proposal would thus reduce the total time requirement for the law degree from seven years to five.

--That an "advanced curriculum" be offered for specialized study beyond the initial law degree for students seeking extraordinary competence in particular fields and for students pursuing careers in teaching and research.

--That an "open curriculum" be made available to students who simply wish to learn more about the law or who seek training that would qualify them for the allied legal professions of advocacy and counselling. After one year of study, an M.A. degree would be awarded.

to be continued  
next week

### WRITING COMPETITION **n.b.**

#### The Journal of Law Reform

and the Law Review will sponsor the second annual joint writing competition to select members for their 1972-1973 junior staffs. A memorandum with general information and topics will be posted in several locations in Hutchins Hall on Tuesday, February 1, or Wednesday, February 2. An orientation meeting for all those interested in the competition will be held at 4:15 on Thursday, February 3, in room 150, Hutchins Hall.

The Law Review continues to be willing to consider for publication any written work prepared for a law school course or seminar by any student. Should any such material be accepted for publication by the Review, the author thereof will be added to the staff of the Review as a full member. The Review encourages the submission of such material in the following manner: two typed copies should be submitted to the Managing Editor with the name and address of the student and the name of the professor and course for which the material was prepared.



# Movies

SACCO IT TO THEM...

by Jesus Crist, Supercritic

I was reading in the paper the other day some typically pretentious reviewer predicting what would be the nominations for the big-deal academy awards. As everyone else has done, he listed Carnal Knowledge as among the best films of the year. Now I happen to think I blew several bucks and had ~~very~~ good memories of Jack Nicholson riding a motorcycle, Art Garfunkle singing, and Mike Nicols directing the Graduate smashed by seeing that flic. So I've decided to write some personal (pretentious) reactions to recent films for this august journal.

Last weekend found me enduring the terminally broken seats and constantly stale popcorn of the fifth forum. But alas, it was for a double feature -- first Sacco and Vanzetti and then a sneak preview of "one of the year's ten best." I'll save the worst for last since I'm still looking for the Pepto Bismol.

Sacco and Vanzetti is a good movie. It's obviously the story of the infamous trial and execution of two Italian "anarchists" during the Red Scare days of Attorney General Palmer. All analogies to recent events will depend on your particular political outlook, so I needn't make them. It is just as obviously propaganda -- but no film on this subject could be eunuchized. Anyway, it's outstanding propaganda -- much better, even, than "Z".

The court room is the overt mode of getting the story of a governmental conspiracy across. Don't see this after taking Evidence or Criminal Procedure or you'll be mumbling "objection" and bothering the hell out of the person next to you. It doesn't take a member of the Italian-American Anti-Defamation League to find reversible error rampant -- Justice Douglas would short circuit his pacemaker very quickly.

cont'd p. 5

# tonight

COLUMBIA PICTURES presents

# MARLON BRANDO

IN *SAM SPIEGEL'S*  
PRODUCTION OF

# THE CHASE

JANE FONDA · ROBERT REDFORD · E.G. MARSHALL  
ANGIE DICKINSON · JANICE RULE · MIRIAM HOPKINS

TECHNICOLOR



A L S O

ABBOT AND COSTELLO

WITH

THE KEYSTONE COPS

IN

"HAVE BADGE, WILL CHASE"

Place: ROOM 100

Time: 7:15  
9:45

Admission: FREE FOR  
LAW STUDENTS,  
OTHERS: 75¢